



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

to arbitrate two questions in respect to both of which we were wrong. It was certainly better to arbitrate than to fight, and so we had the arbitration. Now there were one or two gentlemen, one a very influential senator who was a member of that tribunal, who sincerely believed, I have no doubt, that we were entitled to the municipal dominion of Behring Sea, and that we had a perfect private property in the seals. This senator was very much disappointed, I suspect, that all the impartial arbitrators were against him, and the decision was against us on both those points, with a recommendation which both governments, had they carried it out fairly, would have found effectual for the preservation of the seals. That had a great influence upon this senator and some others, in respect of prejudice against any kind of arbitration; just as we humble people who go to law, when the court has decided against us, from that time forth, until we recover our self-possession, are opposed to all courts.

Then there was another consideration. A large sentiment in the United States had been stringently and urgently excited by the Cubans (whoever they may be) to resist Spanish authority, which everybody knows is just as rightful an authority,—I am not speaking of the justice of its administration,—as we have over Alaska or any other part of the United States. And when we were trying to excite and maintain war in Cuba, and get it to a point where we should be justified upon public principles in recognizing a state of belligerency and then recognizing the independence of Cuba; when we were thus sympathizing and promoting and furnishing materials for war, it would be somewhat curious, at the same moment, to be preaching peace and engaging in arbitration with Her Majesty's government. It would not look well.

And so you will perceive, ladies and gentlemen, that what is reported to have been a failure to carry this treaty by three or four votes, is not, after all, so discouraging. The Senate, while a perpetual body, changes its personnel with most extraordinary rapidity, although the term is for six years. I had not been there but very few years, one of the youngest members in age, when out of the fifty or sixty senators then representing the states that had remained true to the Union, more than half had disappeared off the scene; and I had not been there fifteen years before I was the oldest senator in continuous service who remained. Thus the fact that this treaty has now failed ought not to discourage us in the least. On the contrary, I believe that when the stress in Europe is over, and when the sentiment, which is almost instinctive with Americans, that Her Majesty's government proposed to enter into it just then for reasons not altogether of the largest in the Christian sense, has gone by, negotiations will again be reopened, under better conditions and a more favorable conjunction of circumstances, and on a somewhat wider basis than that of the treaty which has failed, and that many of us,—I hope all of us,—may live to see the first great step, that step which costs and counts, in the attainment of peace and justice among nations as well as among men. (Applause.)

#### ADDRESS OF REV. E. E. HALE, D.D.

I am highly honored in being permitted to take what is the very enviable position of the first speaker on such an occasion. I am sure we all rejoice in the strong, intelligent and hopeful statement of our chairman. I hope

everybody came here in that mood; certainly I did, and I am quite sure that everybody will go away in good spirits.

The advance since last year has been very great. We rose a great deal higher than anybody expected to. Then we had a pretty bad fall, but we have not fallen nearly as low as we were then. This country understands that there is such a question. This country understands, and let me say this convention understands, the language in which we are to speak a great deal better than we did then. We shall not have, I think, in this meeting, what I have a right to call the somewhat vague and spongy use of words which we have had in the two sessions before. We know much better what we are after than we knew then, and the great word which the chairman used just now,—that we have come for much wider business than we ever knew we had come for before,—is a word which I hope will linger with us through the whole of these proceedings.

The truth is, that the whole business of "Diplomacy" is at stake, as has been suggested here, as has been hinted in print. We ought to remember that diplomats by profession, the men who are in bureaus at home or on embassies abroad, are not precisely the people to tell us whether a much broader and nobler foundation shall be established for the intercourse of Christian nations than that on which they have been twitching and pulling and fixing and fussing for two hundred and fifty years. You do not go to a physician of one school to ask him how a physician of another school is to extend the work of that school and to annihilate School Number One; and the diplomatists are not exactly the people who are to be consulted as to the great measure which, in less than a century, will put an end substantially to the methods of "Diplomacy." And when we are told that Lord This or the Marquis of That thinks this is a fad of modern times and will die out, we shall say, "We did not come to ask your opinion. We are going to take the opinion of the civilized and intelligent men of business, men of action, men of thought, men of prayer, of the world." (Applause.)

I wish we might remember, and I wish the gentlemen of the press would find out that this whole business of ambassadors and ministers and envoys and *chargés d'affaires* and Heaven knows what not, is all two hundred and forty-nine years old, and only that. It came into existence with the Treaty of Westphalia, as it will begin to go out of existence with the treaty for which we are here to lay the foundations. Under the present system, when two countries find out that they are countries, when a nation comes to a sense of independence, it looks round and says, "Where can we send some ministers?" I will not say that it is found convenient sometimes to send abroad for four years a gentleman who is very popular at home, though that thing has happened. I will only say that from the love of courts, the love of grand ceremony, and the rest, it is perfectly natural that a young nation like ours should desire to establish itself as being as good as anybody;—quite as a rich Californian when he goes to Paris wants to have as fine carriages and as fine horses as the dukes and the rest who are in Paris. That is all very nice; and so it happens that in every court in the world, the court at Washington included, there is a little cluster of gentlemen, most of them with nothing under the heavens to do but to dress for evening parties, and that to these gentlemen is con-

fided, in the course of business, the affairs of great nations when they have affairs with each other. I do not say but that, for a good many things, this works sufficiently well. I do say that there is no merchant to whom I am speaking who, if he found himself in direct antagonism with a great foreign dealer in a city where he had a branch of his own house, would leave that matter to be determined by one of his own clerks and the clerk of the German firm in London. I think he would find out that there were other tribunals in London than such as these two clerks could manage between themselves.

What happens now? We get into a disturbance with a foreign country. It is illegal to go to Lord Salisbury and say, "We are old friends, my Lord; you and I were in college together, and your daughter visited at my house seventeen years ago. Why won't you sit down and talk this over?" I must not do that. I must send the question, whatever it is, to Washington, and I must go to Washington and explain to Mr. Sherman about it. I must get him to attend to it, to understand it. And when Mr. Sherman "gets round to it," as our Yankee phrase is, he writes a despatch to Mr. Hay who has never heard of the subject before, and knows nothing about it. Mr. Hay, when he "gets round to it," reads this despatch, and then Mr. Hay writes a note to Lord Salisbury, who never heard of the subject before, and calls his attention to the question whether the head-waters of the Mackenzie ought to have trout in them or ought not to have trout in them. And Lord Salisbury says, "These Americans have got another question!" And then he sends to a man in his office and says, "Do you know anything about this?" And the man says, "We know nothing about it." And he says, "Get it up as quick as you can." Observe that all the time everything we have done has been in favor of our own prejudices; we have learned our own lesson, we have worked it out in our own way, and our man in Secretary Sherman's department "got it up" as well as he could. Observe that when it gets over there it is left to another set of men who have another set of prejudices, another set of maps, another set of books, and they "got it up" as well as they could. Then we are ready to begin. Then you go at it for four or five years, and if you get out of it at all you may thank the God who is, and knows no yesterday, to-day and to-morrow.

I say that is not the way in which business-men do anything. It does happen occasionally that a few farmers,—up in Vermont, Mr. Edmunds,—disliking courts, refer things to what they call arbitration; they "leave it out to men." I am very sorry, for my part, that that word "arbitration" ever got mixed up with this affair. What we are after is not one of the accidental arbitrations; we are after a permanent tribunal between the nations. That is the thing we have been after, year after year. That is the thing which was dimly foreshadowed in Mr. Olney's and Lord Salisbury's agreement, though it disappeared more and more as the treaty went on.

But, as I said when I began, I have no fears for this change or that or another in the treaty. I am what may be called an "edge-of-the-wedge man." I believe if you get in the edge of the wedge something will follow. I believe that, when the wedge is once in its place, if the church begins to hammer, and the Boards of Trade begin

to hammer, and the men and women begin to hammer, the wedge will go in and will go through. (Applause.) I was quite indifferent as to the form which the new treaty might take. It was a treaty; and there it is and there it will remain till there is a better treaty, and that treaty will certainly go through.

I need not remind this audience that Jay's Treaty, the great treaty on which is founded all these amicable relations of ours, hung fire two years before the Senate. It was a thing for which men were hanged in effigy, for which they were mobbed; and yet the good sense of Jay's Treaty drove it through at the end of those two years. We shall see Lord Salisbury's and Mr. Olney's treaty driven through in the same way, or some similar treaty. We shall be favored before long with the presence of our learned and distinguished friend Mr. Logan, who had so large a share in the preparation of the memorial of the New York State Bar Association, which has been studied and considered here, and which has received so large a sympathy the world over. Mr. Logan has said very happily that what this means is a sign put up by the young court: "Justice between Nations administered here."

At first they will be very shy about coming to the court. And then there will be perhaps two little nations who will say, "Neither of us has any armor-clads nor any military gentlemen who need promotion, nor any jingoes. Let us go and try this court." And they will look in, pretty meekly, and the reporters will not attend, and the press will turn its back on the whole business. But the court will make a decision, and the decision will be wisdom and truth. And when you have Wisdom and Truth, the Urim and Thummim of the high priest, the world will attend to that decision. No matter whether the world said in advance that it would attend or would not attend. That seems to me to be the weak spot in the Salisbury treaty. The world will do, when the time comes, just what it chooses to do when the time comes; it will not look backward, it will look forward. When the decision is made, by an impartial tribunal, which says, "This is justice," the world will attend, the press will sweep round into line, and the pulpit will speak the words of infinite truth if it knows them.

What we want is a tribunal which shall say, "We have listened to this thing, we have heard testimony, and we have decided." Our President knows perfectly well that in these arbitration courts at Paris, about the seals, about the Alabama, about the trout-stream at the head of the Mackenzie, no one of those great tribunals, had the power to call a witness across the street in which they were sitting; they had to decide without a witness called before them whom they could swear in. And they did decide, and they wrote decisions that the world has attended to. What may we not expect when the great nations of the world shall agree to form a permanent tribunal? I do not care if that tribunal sits for a year writing treatises on international law, before anybody knocks at the door for justice, but at the end of a year or two somebody will knock for justice, and it is on justice that the affairs of this world are going to turn. (Applause.)

One does not have to go very far back in history to see that this is the way in which all courts now existing in England and America began. They knew very well what the feudal system led to in affairs between man and man:

they knew very well what it was to have the Duke of Northumberland administer justice in one way and Lord Marmion administer justice in another way. What happened? There happened to be an institution called the Church of Christ, and that institution said, "You can go into the duke's court if you want to, or into the baron's court; but we have a cathedral here and a court, and if two of our priests quarrel, we administer justice between them by the law of the living God, and that works everywhere. You can come here if you want to." And the people found that justice administered by one law for all England was a good deal better than justice administered by twenty different barons and squires and knights of the shires, so that people began coming into the great church courts, not intended for jurisdiction over them, because justice was done in the church courts by the same law for Yorkshire as for Cornwall, and they meant to have justice administered by that law. And the greatest step in the history of England was when King Henry, catching that notion from the church, sent round and established one law for all England and one set of judges for England. So determined was he that they should be the same judges and the same law that, in all the inconvenience of that time, he made the judge who sat in Cornwall sit afterwards in Essex and then in Lincoln and then in Yorkshire; the whole system of circuits in England began when Henry determined that there should be one law, administered in one way, in the whole of England.

Europe and America are to-day a smaller region than England was then. Europe and America have now more to do with each other than Cornwall had to do with York or Northumberland. And what you and I are here to see established is one system of jurisdiction which shall cover all those regions occupied by the six great powers of Europe and America, to be called the International Court of the Nations. (Applause.)

I do not go much into the history of the thing. I have taken for one of the mottoes by which I direct my life the words of St. Paul, "Forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching forth to the things that are before."

#### ADDRESS OF BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

*Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.*—We are all agreed that the year past has been a very remarkable one. Victor Hugo once condensed into the simple phrase, "*L'Année terrible*," a whole period of French history. I know not what adjective to apply to the year which we have been going through. In some respects it has been a very abominable year, in other respects a very encouraging year.

No good cause is ever greater than when it is first apparently defeated. When a great movement first goes through a conflict which costs it something, it learns for the first time its real strength and what it must do to establish itself. Our Union cause never became really strong until it was defeated at Bull Run. After that fateful day, the country learned that it had serious business on hand and that it must take hold in earnest of what it had so far half played with. I suppose that everybody who has been in any way engaged in this work of arbitration, thinking about it, reading about it, speaking for it, has been more or less disgusted with the action of the Senate in refusing to ratify the arbitration treaty. Some people have hastily concluded from this action that

the movement is for the present all over. Quite the contrary; we have learned, for the first time in the history of the arbitration movement, that we have a serious undertaking on our hands, which is worthy of the very best efforts that we can put forth. We have learned, for the first time in the history of the movement, who many of its friends are; we have learned who are its opponents, and the grounds of their objection, and where to look for the causes of opposition. So, on the whole, I am inclined to think that the year has been the most encouraging one in the whole history of the arbitration movement since the time of the Jay treaty. The action of the Senate and the whole subject of the defeat of the treaty will perhaps be taken up in a later session of this Conference and thoroughly discussed; I shall not take them up at this time. I think, however, we may well consider whether this Conference and all other such conferences have not directed their efforts partially in the wrong direction. We have looked too much, perhaps, to the heads of the government, rather than to the cultivation of public sentiment among the people, and among the representatives of the people in both houses of Congress.

You will be interested in noticing for a moment the actual gain which our cause has made during the past year. There have been not less than a dozen cases of arbitration decided or pending or referred during the year. A case has been decided between Great Britain and Holland; the difficulty between Great Britain and Venezuela has been referred to arbitration; a dispute which arose between Great Britain and Brazil, about the Island of Trinidad, has been settled, through the good offices of Portugal. France and Brazil have recently agreed to submit to arbitration the question of their boundary dispute, involving a larger area, I believe, than the whole territory in dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela. Between the United States and Great Britain we have had a commission sitting at Victoria, British Columbia, which closed its investigations recently, considering the damages due to Canadian sealers under the Paris award. The Alaska boundary question has also been referred to arbitration. We have had recently referred to arbitration a case between the United States and Mexico; one between the Argentine Republic and Chili, and another between Great Britain and Colombia, referred in 1886, are now pending. And there are others.

It is well known also that we have never had in this country so pronounced a public sentiment in favor of this peaceful method of settling international disputes. When the Jay treaty was made, public sentiment was nearly all the other way, as Dr. Hale has told us. Mr. Jay forfeited for the time being his standing among the people of the country. It was as much as people could do to retain their respect for Washington and Hamilton, both of whom earnestly favored the treaty. Then public sentiment was practically all against the peace-seeking diplomacy of the time; but in the exciting period through which we have just been passing, public sentiment in all the great populous states, in nearly all the older states, in the states, almost without exception, where the great newspapers and the great religious weeklies are published, has been with the diplomacy which negotiated this treaty and signed it on the 11th of January. I hardly know of a respectable daily or weekly throughout the whole country that was not on the side of the treaty; that fact has tremendous significance in the history of our movement.